Remarks

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13 and 15-22 are pending in this application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 7, 13, 15 and 22 to clarify the claimed invention. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this application.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 13, 15, 19, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. patent publication 2003/0200058 to Ogawa et al. in view of U.S. patent 6,577,988 to Travagline et al. The Examiner rejected claims 4-7, 11, 12, and 16-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. in view of Travagline et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 7,120,830 to Tonack. The Examiner rejected claims 8 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. in view of Travagline et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 6,006,171 to Vines et al. The Examiner rejected claims 9 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ogawa et al. in view of Travagline et al. and further in view of U.S. patent 7,120,830 to Tonack.

The combination of Ogawa et al. and Travagline et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 13, 15, 19, and 22 since, among other things, the combination does not suggest logging in to the control system by a maintenance user, configuring a software entity recorded on a computer readable medium with an identity of the equipment, plant or process, the software entity including links to information regarding all equipment, plant, and processes monitored and controlled by the control systems, retrieving by the control system, utilizing the links, information associated with the equipment, plant or process with the configured software

11

entity, the information including maintenance information, technical information, operational

information, and contact information for at least one of internal users and external users having

technical knowledge about the selected equipment, plant or process, sending a message by the

control system to the logged in maintenance user of an event or alarm related to the equipment,

plant or process, presenting or displaying by the control system to the maintenance user on a

portable computing device at least information about the event or alarm for the equipment, plant

or process and a location of the equipment, plant or process, utilizing by the maintenance user

the information to address the new event or alarm, and requesting contact by the maintenance

user utilizing the portable computing device with at least one internal user or at least one external

user about the equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the new event

or alarm with the retrieved information, identifying by the control system the at least one internal

user or at least one external user based upon the event or alarm and the equipment, plant or

process, providing contact by the control system with the at least one internal user or at least one

external user and providing of information to the maintenance user by the at least one internal

user or at least one external user to address the new event or alarm.

Ogawa et al. only suggests access of a maintenance worker to drawings and instruction

manuals.

On the other hand, Travagline et al. only suggests sending an alarm message to notify

people of an alarm. Travagline et al. does not suggest that if those who receive the alarm

establish contact with at least one internal user or at least one external user about a selected

equipment, plant or process if the person receiving the alarm cannot address a new event or

alarm, and providing of information to the person receiving the alarm by the at least one internal

user or at least one external user to address the new event or alarm.

There is no suggestion in either of Ogawa et al. or Travagline et al. that a person

receiving notification of an alarm or event would establish contact with an internal or external

party to obtain information regarding the event or alarm. On the other hand, according to the

claimed invention, the control system can utilize links of the software entity to retrieve

information associated with the equipment, plant or process. In contrast, in paragraph 0043,

Ogawa et al. only suggests limited electronic storage of drawings and instruction manuals that

are stored in an electronic filing system. Thus, Ogawa et al. only suggests passive, traditional

information storage. Such traditional methods of storing information are described in the

"Technical Background" section of the present specification at page 2, lines 14-34.

In contrast, according to the claimed invention, information may be retrieved by the

control system automatically utilizing the links to information included in the software entity,

where the links include links to all equipment, plant and processes monitored and controlled by

the control systems. Thus, according to the claimed invention, the maintenance user does not

need to know which instruction manual or drawing or other information to retrieve. Rather, the

software entity and control system already include links to relevant information for an

equipment. This is described at, among other passages, page 8, line 22, through page 9, line 2;

and page 13, line 27, through page 14, line 4.

The claimed invention can identify internal and/or external people with technical

information, experience and/or training about addressing the event or alarm. By carrying out these further steps, the claimed invention can more rapidly and accurately address events and alarms that arise when a maintenance user cannot address the event or alarm. These elements are not suggested by the combination of Ogawa et al. and Travagline et al.

In view of the above, the combination of Ogawa et al. and Travagline et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 13, 15, 19, and 22. Therefore, the combination of Ogawa et al. and Travagline et al. does not make obvious the invention recited in claims 1, 3, 13, 15, 19, and 22. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Tonack does not suggest the invention recited in claims 4-7, 11, 12, and 16-18 since, among other things, Tonack does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Ogawa et al. and Travagline et al. Along these lines, Tonack does not suggest logging in to the control system by a maintenance user, configuring a software entity recorded on a computer readable medium with an identity of the equipment, plant or process, the software entity including links to information regarding all equipment, plant, and processes monitored and controlled by the control systems, retrieving by the control system, utilizing the links, information associated with the equipment, plant or process with the configured software entity, the information including maintenance information, technical information, operational information, and contact information for at least one of internal users and external users having technical knowledge about the selected equipment, plant or process, sending a message by the control system to the logged in maintenance user of an event or alarm related to the equipment, plant or process, presenting or displaying by the control

14

system to the maintenance user on a portable computing device at least information about the event or alarm for the equipment, plant or process and a location of the equipment, plant or process, utilizing by the maintenance user the information to address the new event or alarm, and requesting contact by the maintenance user utilizing the portable computing device with at least one internal user or at least one external user about the equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the new event or alarm with the retrieved information, identifying by the control system the at least one internal user or at least one external user based upon the event or alarm and the equipment, plant or process, providing contact by the control system with the at least one internal user or at least one external user and providing of information to the maintenance user by the at least one internal user or at least one external user to address the new event or alarm.

The Examiner asserts that Tonack at col. 7, lines 4-26, suggests contacting an external user or expert. However, this passage only suggests checking on service calls and sending service calls. Tonack does not suggest a maintenance user retrieving information for use in addressing an alarm or event and contacting an external user or expert to obtain additional information to use in addressing an event or alarm. Tonack only suggests accessing information regarding whether a repair was carried out and when. No technical data is retrieved or supplied by an external user or expert.

In view of the above, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Tonack does not suggest the invention recited in claims 4-7, 11, 12, and 16-18. Therefore, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Tonack does not make obvious the invention recited in claims

15

4-7, 11, 12, and 16-18. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Vines et al. does not suggest the invention recited in claims 8 and 21 since, among other things, Vines et al. does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Ogawa et al. and Travagline et al. Along these lines, Vines does not suggest logging in to the control system by a maintenance user, configuring a software entity recorded on a computer readable medium with an identity of the equipment, plant or process, the software entity including links to information regarding all equipment, plant, and processes monitored and controlled by the control systems, retrieving by the control system, utilizing the links, information associated with the equipment, plant or process with the configured software entity, the information including maintenance information, technical information, operational information, and contact information for at least one of internal users and external users having technical knowledge about the selected equipment, plant or process, sending a message by the control system to the logged in maintenance user of an event or alarm related to the equipment, plant or process, presenting or displaying by the control system to the maintenance user on a portable computing device at least information about the event or alarm for the equipment, plant or process and a location of the equipment, plant or process, utilizing by the maintenance user the information to address the new event or alarm, and requesting contact by the maintenance user utilizing the portable computing device with at least one internal user or at least one external user about the equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the new event or alarm with the retrieved information, identifying by the control system the at least one internal user or at least one external user based upon the event or alarm and the

16

equipment, plant or process, providing contact by the control system with the at least one internal

user or at least one external user and providing of information to the maintenance user by the at

least one internal user or at least one external user to address the new event or alarm.

Vines et al. only suggests a system to manage maintenance orders. Additionally, Vines et

al. does not suggest a portable computing device. Rather, Vines et al. only suggests, "selection

of process control monitoring station, association of equipment tag names in the maintenance

database with process control variables", which does not suggest selecting by a maintenance user

using a hand-held or wearable portable computing device one of the equipment, plant or process.

Vines et al. does not suggest retrieving contact information for internal users having

technical knowledge about a selected equipment, plant or process, and contacting the internal

users about the selected equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot address the

new event or alarm with the retrieved information. Vines et al. only suggests an operator who

generates maintenance work orders, as described at col. 5, line 57, through col. 6, line 2. This

operator does not appear to be a maintenance user who would employ information associated

with the selected equipment, plant or process nor an internal user having technical knowledge

about a selected equipment, plant or process. Also, the "crew assigned to do the work" is not an

internal user having technical knowledge about a selected equipment, plant or process. At most

the "crew" might include the claimed maintenance user. Vines et al. does not suggest retrieving

information including maintenance information and technical information for use in addressing

an event or alarm associated with selected equipment, plant or process. Simply displaying a

maintenance issue and other maintenance issues does not suggest displaying information used to

solve the maintenance issues.

Furthermore, Vines et al. also does not suggest configuring a software entity recorded on a computer readable medium with an identity of the selected equipment, plant or process, the software entity including links to information regarding all equipment, plant, process monitored and controlled by the control systems. Vines et al. only suggests a line between a process variable and a piece of equipment. Also, Vines et al. does not suggest links to information regarding all equipment, plant, or process monitored and controlled by the control systems. Additionally, Vines et al. only suggests generating work orders, tracking work orders, and checking a status of work orders.

In view of the above, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Vines does not suggest the invention recited in claims 8 and 21. Therefore, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Vines does not make obvious the invention recited in claims 8 and 21. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

The combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al., Vines and Tonack does not suggest the invention recited in claims 9 and 10 since, among other things, Tonack does not overcome the above-described deficiencies of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al. and Vines. Along these lines, Tonack does not suggest logging in to the control system by a maintenance user, configuring a software entity recorded on a computer readable medium with an identity of the equipment, plant or process, the software entity including links to information regarding all equipment, plant, and processes monitored and controlled by the control systems, retrieving by the control system,

utilizing the links, information associated with the equipment, plant or process with the
configured software entity, the information including maintenance information, technical
information, operational information, and contact information for at least one of internal users
and external users having technical knowledge about the selected equipment, plant or process,
sending a message by the control system to the logged in maintenance user of an event or alarm
related to the equipment, plant or process, presenting or displaying by the control system to the
maintenance user on a portable computing device at least information about the event or alarm
for the equipment, plant or process and a location of the equipment, plant or process, utilizing by
the maintenance user the information to address the new event or alarm, and requesting contact
by the maintenance user utilizing the portable computing device with at least one internal user or
at least one external user about the equipment, plant or process if the maintenance user cannot
address the new event or alarm with the retrieved information, identifying by the control system
the at least one internal user or at least one external user based upon the event or alarm and the
equipment, plant or process, providing contact by the control system with the at least one internal
user or at least one external user and providing of information to the maintenance user by the at
least one internal user or at least one external user to address the new event or alarm.

The Examiner asserts that Tonack suggests configuring equipment, plant or process with
an identity of an internal user. However, this passage only suggests listing maintenance calls in a
particular location or relating to a particular type of production equipment. This passage does
not suggest configuring equipment, plant or process with an identity of an internal user with
which a maintenance user may establish contact if the maintenance user cannot address a new
event or alarm. Tonack only suggests accessing information regarding whether a repair was

19

carried out and when. Tonack does not suggest retrieving or supplying technical data by an external user or expert associated with an equipment, plant or process.

In view of the above, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al., Vines and Tonack does not suggest the invention recited in claims 9 and 10. It follows that, the combination of Ogawa et al., Travagline et al., Vines and Tonack does not make the invention recited in claims 9 and 10 obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

In view of the above, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not suggest patentable features of the claimed invention. Therefore, the references relied upon in the office action, whether considered alone or in combination, do not make the claimed invention obvious. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejections based upon the cited references.

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of this case and issuance of the Notice of Allowance.

If an interview would advance the prosecution of this case, Applicants urge the Examiner to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The undersigned authorizes the Commissioner to charge fee insufficiency and credit

overpayment associated with this communication to Deposit Account No. 22-0261.

                                    Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 16, 2011   /Eric J. Franklin/
                                     Eric J. Franklin, Reg. No. 37,134
                                     Attorney for Applicants
                                     Venable LLP
                                     575 Seventh Street, NW
                                     Washington, DC 20004
                                     Telephone: 202-344-4936
                                     Facsimile: 202-344-8300